

PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

DATE: July 18, 2012

CALLED TO ORDER: 5:35 p.m.

ADJOURNED: 7:51 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Attending Members

Mary Moriarty Adams, Chair
Vernon Brown
Aaron Freeman
Benjamin Hunter
Frank Mascari
William Oliver
Leroy Robinson
Joseph Simpson

Absent Members

Marilyn Pfisterer

PROPOSAL NO. 173, 2012 - appoints Joe Shikany to the Marion County Community Corrections Advisory Board
"Table"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 228, 2012 - establishes a study commission to examine and investigate current policies and procedures relating to the re-entry of ex-offender
"Do Pass"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 239, 2012 - appropriates \$74,123 in the 2012 Budget of the Marion County Public Defender Agency (County General Fund) for the salary and benefits of the mitigation specialist and a portion of the contractual expenses related to the Thomas Hardy death penalty case
"Do Pass"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 240, 2012 - appropriates \$1,250,898 in the 2012 Budget of the Marion County Sheriff (Emergency Telephone System Fund) to cover a one year extension on the AT&T contract for the E911 telephone system, funded with revenues from the MECA Debt Service Fund
"Do Pass as Amended"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 241, 2012 - appropriates \$550,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (State Law Enforcement Fund) to help cover a budget shortfall in salaries for the IMPD forfeiture unit

"Do Pass"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 242, 2012 - appropriates \$55,927 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IMPD General Law Enforcement Equipment and Training Subfund) for training and equipping IMPD officers, funded by revenues received from visiting NFL teams that pay fees for escort vehicles

"Do Pass as Amended"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 243, 2012 - appropriates \$175,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (State Law Enforcement Fund) to pay salaries and benefits of transcriptionists through June 30, 2012

"Do Pass as Amended"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 244, 2012 - appropriates \$402,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety, Animal Care and Control Division (City Cumulative Fund) to purchase and equip eight vehicles and pay for repairs and upgrades to the city's animal shelter

"Do Pass"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 245, 2012 - appropriates \$757,069 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IMPD General Fund) to restore funding for salaries and benefits that were required to be cut from the IMPD budget by order of the DLGF

"Do Pass"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 246, 2012 - appropriates \$3,203,771 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IMPD General Fund) to cover the reimbursement of IMPD operating expenses during the Super Bowl, funded by revenues received from the Capital Improvements Board and the NFL

"Do Pass as Amended"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 247, 2012 - appropriates \$413,813 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (Federal Grants Fund) to cover the costs of Task Force One (Urban Search and Rescue) for the purchase of equipment and supplies in their response to local deployments, for training, fuel, overtime, travel and other items, funded by a grant from the Department of Homeland Security

"Do Pass"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 248, 2012 - appropriates \$422,722 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety, Fire Division (Fire General Fund) to reimburse expenses incurred by IFD during the Super Bowl event, funded by revenues received from the Capital Improvements Board

"Do Pass"

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 249, 2012 - appropriates \$93,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety, Fire Division (Fire General Fund) to supplement personal services, funded by revenues received from IUPUI for fire protection services

“Do Pass”

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 250, 2012 - appropriates \$59,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (City Cumulative Capital Improvement Fund) to provide for the required 50% match on bullet proof vest grants

“Do Pass as Amended”

Vote: 8-0

PROPOSAL NO. 251, 2012 - approves a transfer of \$18,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (Public Safety Communications General Fund) from Character 02 to Character 05 for fuel costs

“Do Pass”

Vote: 8-0

Presentation by the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) regarding the Baker One Initiative – Major Tom Kern and Captain Mark Rice

Presentation by the Domestic Violence Network regarding the community efforts to reduce domestic violence – Marla Taylor, Kelly McBride

PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

The Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee of the City-County Council met on Wednesday, July 18, 2012. Chair Mary Moriarty Adams called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. with the following members present: Vernon Brown, Aaron Freeman, Benjamin Hunter, Frank Mascari, William Oliver, Leroy Robinson, and Joseph Simpson. Marilyn Pfisterer was absent.

Chair Moriarty Adams asked for the committee's consent to hear Proposal Nos. 247, 248, and 249, 2012 first. Consent was given.

PROPOSAL NO. 247, 2012 - appropriates \$413,813 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (Federal Grants Fund) to cover the costs of Task Force One (Urban Search and Rescue) for the purchase of equipment and supplies in their response to local deployments, for training, fuel, overtime, travel and other items, funded by a grant from the Department of Homeland Security

Valerie Washington, Chief Financial Officer, Department of Public Safety (DPS), stated that the appropriation is for Indiana Task Force One.

Councillor Oliver asked what is meant by local deployment. Deborah Hood, Indiana Task Force One, stated that the most recent deployment was for the Henryville tornado in March of 2012, which covered fuel and travel expenses. She stated that the bulk of the funds came from re-appropriated funds that had lapsed in 2011 from the Urban Search and Rescue Grant. A spreadsheet with a breakdown of costs has been submitted as Exhibit A.

Councillor Simpson asked where the bulk of the money is being spent. Ms. Hood stated that the money is used for supplies and equipment.

Councillor Freeman asked how much of the funding goes toward training. Ms. Hood stated that each position on the task force is designated to specific individuals. Each individual goes through training as needed, and has to meet Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) requirements. When there is a national FEMA training, two people from each task force has to complete the training. Ms. Hood stated that about \$35,000 is used for training.

PROPOSAL NO. 248, 2012 - appropriates \$422,722 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety, Fire Division (Fire General Fund) to reimburse expenses incurred by IFD during the Super Bowl event, funded by revenues received from the Capital Improvements Board (CIB)

Ms. Washington stated that DPS incurred costs preparing for the Super Bowl and expected to be reimbursed for the expenses. The Indianapolis Fire Department (IFD) is putting to money back in Characters 01, 02 and 05.

PROPOSAL NO. 249, 2012 - appropriates \$93,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety, Fire Division (Fire General Fund) to supplement personal services, funded by revenues received from IUPUI for fire protection services

Ms. Washington stated that DPS received funding from Indiana University Purdue University-Indianapolis (IUPUI) for providing fire protection services. The \$93,000 covers fire protection from 2011. DPS is expecting another payment in the same amount for 2012. Ms. Washington stated that plans are in the works with IUPUI and City Legal to draft a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to memorialize the provided service.

Councillor Simpson asked how IUPUI is billed for the service. Ernest Malone, IFD Chief stated that the agreement between IUPUI and IFD has been in place for several years. He stated that the funds are given based upon the agreement between the two entities.

Councillor Hunter stated that State Statute only allows one university to use fire protection services. He asked why IUPUI is being provided the extra service. Chief Malone stated that he will conduct research on the history of the agreement and will follow up with Councillor Hunter on his findings. Jim Steele, DPS consultant, stated that the agreement has been in place for many years and DPS hopes that MOU will be able to show a calculation of how IUPUI is being charged.

Councillor Brown stated that the agreement is IUPUI's attempt to make a contribution. It is voluntary for IUPUI. The MOU will help.

Councillor Simpson moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to send Proposal Nos. 247, 248, and 249, 2012 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 239, 2012 - appropriates \$74,123 in the 2012 Budget of the Marion County Public Defender Agency (County General Fund) for the salary and benefits of the mitigation specialist and a portion of the contractual expenses related to the Thomas Hardy death penalty case

Bob Hill, Chief Public Defender, Marion County Public Defender Agency (MCPDA), stated that in 2011, MCPDA agreed to front the money for the Thomas Hardy death penalty case and is now asking for reimbursement of the funds. He stated that the agency put forth \$65,427 from their Character 01 fund and \$8,696 from their Character 03 fund.

Councillor Simpson asked if the \$74,123 is the entire amount of funds used for the case. Chief Hill stated that it is the amount used in 2012.

Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to send Proposal No. 239, 2012 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 240, 2012 - appropriates \$1,250,898 in the 2012 Budget of the Marion County Sheriff (Emergency Telephone System Fund) to cover a one year extension on the AT&T contract for the E911 telephone system, funded with revenues from the MECA Debt Service Fund

Louis Dezelan, Executive Director, Marion County Sheriff's Department (MCSD), stated that the Metropolitan Emergency Communications Agency (MECA) delegated the responsibility of the Emergency Telephone Service to MCSD. The contract with AT&T ended February 2012. MCSD extended the contract for a year due to lack of timing to re-bid the entire contract. He stated the since February, MCSD has paid the bill out of their general budget on a monthly basis. As such, the funds will be used as reimbursement and to pay the remainder of the contract for the year.

Councillor Freeman asked if the reimbursement will help to alleviate the budget problem; and if MCSD reached out to companies other than AT&T for a possible contract. Mr. Dezelan stated that the debt discussed earlier in the year did not include the current issue; however, MCSD did discuss taking on the responsibility of the emergency telephone service as an unfunded responsibility. He stated that this is their first time working with AT&T, due to the new responsibility, and they did not reach out to any other telephone provider.

Councillor Brown stated that the contract was inherited.

Councillor Hunter stated that the language of the MECA fund should be amended as the MECA is no longer in existence. He asked where the funds for the E911 telephone systems were going. Julie Keen, Deputy Controller, Office of Finance and Management (OFM), stated that once the funds have drained from MECA, it will no longer exist. She stated that E911 has its own fund.

Councillor Simpson moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to "Amend" Proposal No. 240, 2012 as described in Exhibit B. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

Councillor Robinson moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to send Proposal No. 240, 2012 to the full Council with a "Do Pass as Amended" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

Chair Moriarty Adams asked for the committee's consent to hear Proposal Nos. 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 250, and 251 2012 together. Consent was given.

PROPOSAL NO. 241, 2012 - appropriates \$550,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (State Law Enforcement Fund) to help cover a budget shortfall in salaries for the IMPD forfeiture unit

Ms. Washington, stated that the funds will be used to help fund the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) Forfeiture Unit, which consists of four sworn investigators, one sworn supervisor, and four civilian positions. A portion of the funds received from forfeitures is split with the Marion County Prosecutor's Office (MCPO).

Councillor Brown asked if there was sufficient budgeting for the fund in 2012. Ms. Washington stated that there were shortfalls throughout the IMPD fund. As such, the Special Revenue fund is used to offset some of the shortfalls in order to alleviate some of the costs from the IMPD fund. Councillor Brown asked if there was a shortfall in the budget for the specified group of

personnel. Ms. Washington stated that the funds initially came from the IMPD fund, but have been transferred to the State Law Enforcement Fund to help balance the budget. Ms. Keen stated that there were previous problems with balancing out the accounts between MCPO and IMPD. There was a decision made to make a conservative budget for the State Law Enforcement Fund. She stated that IMPD requested the funds in 2011. She added that it was an agreement that the appropriation of the funds would be approved at a later date.

PROPOSAL NO. 242, 2012 - appropriates \$55,927 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IMPD General Law Enforcement Equipment and Training Subfund) for training and equipping IMPD officers, funded by revenues received from visiting NFL teams that pay fees for escort vehicles

Ms. Washington stated that the original proposal was Proposal No. 82, 2011, which gave IMPD the authority to collect the fee. The proposal states that the money collected from NFL escorts can be used to provide training and equipment purchases.

Councillor Freeman asked for the breakdown of the usage of funds. Ms. Washington stated that \$10,000 will be used for training; and approximately \$45,000 will be used for equipment; and will be divided between Characters 02 and 04.

Councillor Simpson moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to "Amend" Proposal No. 242, 2012, as described in Exhibit C. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 243, 2012 - appropriates \$175,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (State Law Enforcement Fund) to pay salaries and benefits of transcriptionists through June 30, 2012

Ms. Washington stated that the funds request will help supplement the cost of the transcriptions unit. There are seven transcriptionist, one of which is bilingual. The individuals are key to the court process, as they transcribe detectives' statements, which help prepare the prosecutors and defense attorneys for court. The funding for the transcriptionist has been secured for 2012.

Councillor Simpson moved, seconded by Councillor Brown, to "Amend" Proposal No. 243, 2012, as described in Exhibit D. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

Councillor Freeman asked how the fund balance remain the same. Ms. Washington stated that the proposal is already factored into the fund balance. Councillor Freeman stated that transcripts are an aid to the jury and are not factored in as evidence, as such there may come a time when transcriptionists will not be needed for budget reasons. Ms. Washington stated that the issue has come up and DPS is looking at different solutions.

PROPOSAL NO. 244, 2012 - appropriates \$402,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety, Animal Care and Control Division (City Cumulative Fund) to purchase and equip eight vehicles and pay for repairs and upgrades to the city's animal shelter

Ms. Washington stated that Indianapolis Animal Care and Control (IACC) is seeking funding to install a heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system at the kennel and replace damaged ceiling tiles. The kennel is owned by Building Authority, so DPS is working with the agency on receiving bids to fix the problem. She stated that IACC is looking to purchase eight vans for the IACC officers. The older vehicles do not have air conditioning and continuously break down and need repairs. She added that that DPS is working on a regular vehicle replacement program.

Councillor Brown asked if the requested funding will adequately equip the vans. Amber Myers, Director, IACC, stated that the officers will have adequate equipment, such as laptops, in the vans while they are out on the streets. She stated that the new vehicles are fuel-efficient Ford Transits.

Councillor Oliver asked if the vehicles will be equipped with air-conditioning. Ms. Myers stated that the vehicles have different cooling systems in the cab of the vehicle and in the back of the vehicle where the animals are briefly housed. Councillor Oliver asked if the kennel has adequate cooling. Ms. Myers stated that there is a building that does not have heating or cooling, so a door is left open to cool it down. This issue has caused the ceiling tiles to become moist and damaged.

PROPOSAL NO. 245, 2012 - appropriates \$757,069 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IMPD General Fund) to restore funding for salaries and benefits that were required to be cut from the IMPD budget by order of the DLGF

Ms. Keen stated that at the beginning of the year, the Department of Local Government Finance (DLGF) reduced the budget of IMPD and IFD for what was thought to be a lack of revenue to support the budget. The portions that support the budget have since been deposited into the funds.

Councillor Oliver ask if staffing was removed due to the budget issue. Ms. Keen stated that the DLGF does not look at departmental budgets, instead they look at funds. In this case, the department was looking at the total appropriations that are pulled from a particular fund, such as the IMPD and IFD funds.

Councillor Brown asked if the balanced budget was actually short \$700. Ms. Keen stated that the budget was balanced. She stated that DLGF disagreed with the revenue, but later acknowledged that it was correct.

PROPOSAL NO. 246, 2012 - appropriates \$3,203,771 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (IMPD General Fund) to cover the reimbursement of IMPD operating expenses during the Super Bowl, funded by revenues received from the Capital Improvements Board (CIB) and the NFL

Ms. Washington stated that the requested funds would be appropriated into Character 01 of the IMPD General Fund to cover officer time and over-time tied to the Super Bowl. Funds would be appropriated to Character 03 for supplies and equipment, and a small amount would go back into Character 05 to reimburse for fuel usage.

Councillor Brown asked Ms. Washington to give examples of the type of equipment that is being replaced. Ms. Washington stated that Character 03 is where the most help is needed as leases, pagers, phone expenses, and Building Authority rent. Many of the equipment purchases were budgeted out of Character 03, and DPS would like to put money back into the Character 03 budget.

Councillor Simpson asked if the initial report was based on equipment and supplies. Ms. Washington stated that there is a very detailed reimbursement outline of all equipment used, which was submitted to the CIB.

Councillor Mascari asked if some of the funding will be used to replace taser batteries, ammunition and toilet paper. Ms. Washington stated that there is funding set aside for basic necessities, as well as funding for batteries, ammunition and vests for IMPD officers.

Councillor Simpson moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to "Amend" Proposal No. 246, 2012, as described in Exhibit E. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 250, 2012 - appropriates \$59,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (City Cumulative Capital Improvement Fund) to provide for the required 50% match on bullet proof vest grants

Ms. Washington stated that IMPD is involved in the Bulletproof Vest Partnership. It is a federal grant that helps law enforcement agencies obtain bulletproof vests for their officers. She stated that a stipulation of the grant is that DPS has to provide a fifty percent match. There is language in the Cumulative Fund that allows DPS to use the funds to purchase body armor for law enforcement officers. She stated that there is a regular replacement schedule, as vests have a five-year shelf life. Ms. Washington stated that the plan for 2012 is to purchase 447 vests and 638 vests in 2013. The funds also include a match for two bulletproof vest grants. One grant expires on August 30, 2012 and the other grant will cover IMPD until August 30, 2013.

Councillor Brown suggested that DPS gradually purchases the vests, in order to prevent them from all expiring at the same time. Val Cunningham, Deputy Chief of IMPD, stated that IMPD inherited a situation where over 900 vests expire in 2012. The manufacturer agreed to extend the warranty on 450 of the vests.

Councillor Freeman asked from where the problem came. Chief Cunningham stated that in 2007, there was a problem with the material of the vests and it was decided to purchase all new vests instead of switching out panels, which took IMPD out of the renewal rotation.

Councillor Hunter stated that it is a state law that requires law enforcement agencies to purchase new vests for all law enforcement officers.

Councillor Simpson moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to "Amend" Proposal No. 250, 2012, as described in Exhibit F. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 251, 2012 - approves a transfer of \$18,000 in the 2012 Budget of the Department of Public Safety (Public Safety Communications General Fund) from Character 02 to Character 05 for fuel costs

Ms. Washington stated that when MECA prepared their budget, it was prepared as a county agency budget. It has since been moved to the City, under DPS Communications, and is budgeted for fuel and maintenance out of Character 05.

Councillor Oliver asked when the draft for the fuel surcharge will be completed. Ms. Washington stated that it should hopefully be completed in the Fall.

Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to send Proposal Nos. 241, 244, 245, and 251, 2012 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0

Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to send Proposal Nos. 242, 243, 246, and 250, 2012 to the full Council with a "Do Pass as Amended" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 228, 2012 - establishes a study commission to examine and investigate current policies and procedures relating to the re-entry of ex-offender

Councillor Vop Osili stated that the purpose of the study commission is to look for ways to provide a more successful outcome for the recidivism rate of individuals with a criminal record. He stated that every year between 4,600 and 5,000 individuals return to Marion County for incarceration. A study completed by the Indiana University School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) showed that, within a three-year time frame, 51.6 percent of individuals returned to Marion County for incarceration. The idea is to provide an opportunity for ex-offenders to be successful. The cost for re-incarcerating one percent of the individuals is \$1.55 million. The study commission would look at the best practices from peer cities, in order to find a solution to the recidivism problem. He added that if the individuals were given more opportunities to find work, then it would not only stabilize their homes, but also their neighborhoods and communities. He added that the idea is to get agencies, such as the Prosecutor's Office and the Superior Courts, to get involved in the study.

Councillor Simpson encouraged approval of the proposal. He stated that many ex-offenders want a job and a driver's license, but are not able to do so because of their criminal record. He stated that many peer cities have begun to omit the question asking if a person has a criminal record

from job applications. Councillor Osili stated that 65 – 70 percent of employers in Marion County will not hire ex-offenders without consideration of the type of crime that was committed.

Councillor Hunter stated a representative of MCSD could possibly contribute more insight on the recidivism issue. He stated that a challenge, when looking at jail numbers is, cost always being an issue. He suggested hiring an outside consultant to work on the study.

Councillor Brown suggested a partnership with the Mayor. He asked Councillor Osili to describe the powers and duties of the commission. Councillor Osili briefly described the duties as follows:

1. Review current practices surrounding offender sentencing, incarceration, release, and re-integration into the county;
2. Review sentencing practices/guidelines and their role in supporting or crippling successful re-integration;
3. Review costs associated with the processing, prosecution, incarceration, release, probation, and community supervision of the offender, and determine how the funds are utilized and their efficiency and effectiveness as measured by the successful re-integration of the re-entrant population;
4. Review sources of payment of costs and how they are utilized;
5. Create community goals/targets for successful re-integration of re-entrants into the community and study the potential impact on the city's economic development;
6. Review national best practices for successful re-integration, including use of public funds utilized in the process of prosecution, sentencing, incarceration, and release of offenders;
7. Review the service provider entities, which have been most successful in lowering recidivism rates and recommending means of streamlining and possibly eliminating those which have not;
8. Analyze economic cost/benefit to city/county of incorporating any new policies;
9. Review current barriers to re-entrant employment, housing, and other necessities;
10. Review best practices to encourage more private sector employers to review their hiring and screening policies, and provide more non-discriminatory hiring opportunities;
11. Review and analyze our supportive services (housing, workforce development, etc.) and ways to improve their role in successful re-integration; and
12. Establish a periodic review of the county's recidivism rate and create a method of measuring and tracking successful performance and re-integration of the re-entrants.

Councillor Simpson moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to send Proposal No. 228, 2012 to the full Council with a "Do Pass" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 173, 2012 - appoints Joe Shikany to the Marion County Community Corrections Advisory Board

Councillor Brown moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver, to "Table" Proposal No. 172, 2012. The motion carried by a vote of 8-0.

Presentation by the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) regarding the Baker One Initiative – Major Tom Kern and Captain Mark Rice

Major Kern stated that the Baker One Initiative is modeled after a 2002 initiative based out of Charlotte, North Carolina, that is focused on reducing serious domestic violence assault and domestic violence homicide, which has had a great deal of success. The modeled has been modified to fit IMPD's and Indianapolis' needs. The project is designed to accomplish three goals: early identification of high risk offenders and their victim; early intervention efforts for the offender and the victim; and to strengthen and increase prosecutable cases against high risk offenders of domestic violence. IMPD not only looks at the physical aspect of domestic violence, but it also looks at indicator crimes, such as vandalism and invasion of privacy. Major Kern stated that the project was piloted on the Eastside of the Indianapolis in August of 2011 and has since been launched city-wide. All IMPD officers participated in an online e-learning session with different modules that focused on the Baker One Initiative and the Domestic Violence Officer Information Sheet (attached as Exhibit G). Each district is assigned a Baker One coordinator, as well as a detective to investigate domestic violence cases that do not go to the centralized unit. A formal review is being conducted by the Domestic Violence Network (DVN) to review IMPD protocol and outcomes in the long run.

Captain Rice stated that the initiative aims to not only provide services to the victim but to the offender as well. Some of these services include substance abuse treatment and counseling. He stated that the goal of the initiative is to lower the amount of domestic physical assault and domestic homicide in the City of Indianapolis. Some notable aspects and accomplishments of the initiative include:

- The project places pressure on the offender, not the victim
- The project allows for pro-active policing as well as data driven efforts
 - Offers of services to the offenders by IMPD
 - Identification of potentially lethal situations before homicide occurs
 - Victim outreach by IMPD staff and advocates
- IMPD has expanded the project from a policing initiative to an important component in Indianapolis' community-coordinated response to domestic violence. Some key points include:
 - A formal partnership with the Prosecutor's Office, parole and probation so offenders will be followed from arrest to sentencing
 - A formal partnership with local service providers will accept self-referrals from offenders
 - The support and partnership of the Department of Child Services (DCS) to recognize Baker One offenders and victims who may be in their system
 - Raising awareness of the program throughout Marion County

Jennifer Reister, Domestic Violence Supervisor with the Julian Center, stated that since beginning the Baker One Initiative the following has occurred:

- Increased law enforcement attention and interest in domestic violence cases in general

- More detailed reports on incidents
- Increased investigation efforts of indicator crime police reports
- Creation of Officer Information Sheet
- Baker One offender identification, officer information sheets, and other information gathered by advocates will be used by DPS, IMPD and the Prosecutor's Office to examine resource allocation and apply for grants
- Increased community awareness and interest in domestic violence issues
- Interest from other cities in replication the project in their jurisdiction

Councillor Oliver asked how soon an investigation will be conducted when a third party reports a child being abused. Major Kern stated that citizens should provide as much information as possible. He stated that the more information that is received, the better the chance that the issue will be investigated.

Councillor Brown efforts have increased to help with the language barrier of Spanish speaking individuals. Ms. Reister stated that there are two bilingual individuals to help with language barriers within the Hispanic community.

Presentation by the Domestic Violence Network (DVN) regarding the community efforts to reduce domestic violence – Marla Taylor and Kelly McBride

Kelly McBride, Program Coordinator, DVN, stated that DVN has a rich history of collaborating with the community to develop a community wide plan to end domestic violence in Central Indiana. In 2000, former Mayor Bart Peterson hosted a Mayor's Roundtable involving over 100 citizens of Greater Indianapolis, who together called for the creation of a community plan to provide an accountable, comprehensive and culturally sensitive approach to preventing family violence, which DVN facilitated that creation of the first plan. In 2005, former Mayor Peterson and DVN convened a second Mayor's Community Roundtable to provide an update on the 2001 plan and discuss areas for improvement. Topics that were discussed include: the Hispanic Population, Public Awareness, Education, Jobs, Child Care, Legal Issues, Health Issues and Prevention. In early 2008, with the support of Mayor Gregory Ballard and Congressman Andre Carson, DVN established a new Community Plan Steering Committee charged with providing oversight and guidance during the assessment and a planning and implementation process to ensure that a new plan would be timely, relevant, effective and accurately reflect the changing needs of Central Indiana.

Ms. Taylor, Grants Manager and Program Assistant, DVN, stated that the goals and objectives laid out in Peace in Our Homes: A Call to End Domestic Abuse in Central Indiana (PIOH), reflects the community's needs and the commitment to end domestic abuse. The goals were developed based on the input of 200 individuals. Implementation began in 2009 and the plan formally ended in December 2011.

Ms. McBride stated that since the ending of PIOH, DVN and the community have recognized the importance of formally evaluating Peace in Our Homes using an independent and neutral evaluator. The DVN has contracted with Community Solutions, Inc., a community development

consultant firm, to evaluate the plan by the end of Summer 2012. After the evaluation is complete, DVN and Community Solutions, Inc. will share the results both electronically and through a community forum, which will enable the community to ask questions and give comments and feedback.

Ms. Taylor stated that the planning process is very fragmented and not rich in detail. The plan will be driven by the community. With the input and support of stakeholders, DVN hopes to unveil the next community-wide plan in October, 2013.

Ms. McBride stated that although PIOH has formally ended, the community has not stopped working to end domestic violence. Some initiatives were a direct result of the work the implementation teams did, while other initiatives coincided with PIOH. Some programs including the healthy relationship education program for teens called safe dates; the self-sufficiency fund that provides survivors a hands up toward reaching self sufficiency; the domestic violence fatality review team; and data collection that are still happening as a natural progression from PIOH. She stated that some of the important programs fit into the PIOH initiatives and are housed with member agencies. Ms. McBride gave examples of the programs which include: Bridges Out of Poverty, which helps participants better understand the unique barriers faced by those living in poverty; Circles of Support, which empowers those in poverty to successfully navigate the hidden rules of class; The Allstate Financial Literacy Program for survivors of domestic violence; and Emergency Bed Space, which provides alternative safe housing options for victims when emergency shelters are full.

Ms. Taylor stated that there are two programs in particular that have sparked in the community: Baker One and the Community Defined Solutions Grant. Baker One is an IMPD policing initiative that focuses on early intervention to alleged offenders with the key goal of preventing domestic violence related homicide and serious assault. The Domestic Violence Network was asked to assist with the initiative and has worked to bring community partners to the table to make it a collaborative program within the criminal justice system. She stated that another example of a community initiative is the Community Defined Solutions Grant, which is a federal grant held by the City of Indianapolis and includes The Julian Center, IMPD, MCPO and DVN. The focus of the grant is to coordinate Indianapolis' community response to domestic violence within the criminal justice system. The grant partners have chosen to focus on the expansion of Baker One for the next grant cycle.

Ms. McBride stated that agencies involved in the initiatives are all tied into the criminal justice system. While the coordinated community response that is happening in the criminal justice system is certainly not representative of the community-wide plan, it is happening now and Mayor Ballard has asked DVN to be a part of it because of our unique ability to bring community agencies together. She stated that although DVN is very involved in the criminal justice coordinated community response, they are in the process of the evaluation of PIOH and the development of the next plan.

Councillor Simpson asked if the program offers legal assistance for victims who need help with issues such as filing for divorce and protection. Ms McBride stated that there are agencies that will assist with protective services and divorce filings.

Chair Moriarty Adams asked if there are sufficient facilities for victims of domestic violence to stay. Ms. Taylor stated that DVN is trying to secure funding for emergency bed space and emergency shelter to address that specific issue, as there are instances when the shelters are full but victims still need a safe place to stay. Chair Moriarty Adams asked if grant funding would be used to help victims transition from the shelters. Julia Kathary, Executive, Director, Colburn Place, stated that Colburn Place is a charitable organization that has a Section 42 low income tax credit partnership, which gives the organization seed money from year to year. The organizations also relies on grants and community fundraising opportunities.

With no further business pending, and upon motion duly made, the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee of the City-County Council was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Moriarty Adams, Chair
Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee

MMA/slp

Proposal No 240, 2012

MOTION TO AMEND

Madame Chair:

I respectfully move to amend Proposal 240, 2012, as introduced and before this committee, by deleting the portions stricken through and replacing with the underlined portions, as shown below.

May McIntyre Adams

Councillor

Date

SECTION 4. Upon Approval and other pending approvals, the following unappropriated fund balances are projected to remain at the end of 2012:

	Projected 2012 year-end balance
MECA Debt Service Fund	\$88,000
<u>Emergency Telephone</u> <u>System/E-911 Fund</u>	<u>\$247,000</u>

Proposal No 242, 2012

MOTION TO AMEND

Madame Chair:

I respectfully move to amend section 4 of Proposal 242, 2012, as introduced and before this committee, by deleting the portions stricken through and replacing with the underlined portions, as shown below.

Mary Morissette 7/17/12
Councillor Date

SECTION 4. Upon Approval of this and other pending approvals proposals, the following unappropriated fund balances are projected to remain at the end of 2012:

	Projected 2012 year-end balance
IMPD General Fund (Law	\$3,662,000
Enforcement Equip & Training	\$31,000
subfund)	

Proposal No 243, 2012

MOTION TO AMEND

Madame Chair:

I respectfully move to amend Proposal 243, 2012, as introduced and before this committee, by deleting the portions stricken through and replacing with the underlined portions, as shown below.

Mary Moriarty Adams

Councillor

Date

~~SECTION 3. The said additional appropriation is supported by the Fire General Fund for \$175,000, which was not previously budgeted in the 2012 budget, in the total amount of \$175,000.~~

SECTION 4 3. Upon Approval of this and other pending approvals proposals, the following unappropriated fund balances are projected to remain at the end of 2012:

	Projected 2012 year-end balance
State Law Enforcement Fund	\$1,783,000

Proposal No 246, 2012

MOTION TO AMEND

Madame Chair:

I respectfully move to amend Proposal 246, 2012, as introduced and before this committee, by deleting the portions stricken through and replacing with the underlined portions, as shown below.

Mary Moriarty Adams 7/17/12
Councillor Date

SECTION 3. Upon Approval of this and other pending approvals proposals, the following unappropriated fund balances are projected to remain at the end of 2012:

	Projected 2012 year-end balance
State Law Enforcement Fund	\$3,960,840
IMPD General	\$3,662,000

Proposal No 250, 2012

MOTION TO AMEND

Madame Chair:

I respectfully move to amend Proposal 250, 2012, as introduced and before this committee, by deleting the portions stricken through and replacing with the underlined portions, as shown below.

Mary Moriarty-Gibson 7/17/12
Councillor Date

SECTION 2. The Department of Public Safety Agency additional appropriations are supported by the City Cumulative Fund. These funds will be used to fund the 50% match required for the Bullet Proof Vest grants.

The following changes in appropriations are hereby approved:

CITY AGENCY	Fund	char 1	char 2	char 3	char 4	char 5	NET TOTAL
DPS-IMPD	City Cumulative Fund	59,000 0	59,000				59,000

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Officer Information Sheet

Marion County, Indiana

Date _____ Beat _____ Case Number _____

VICTIM	SUSPECT
<input type="checkbox"/> ANGRY <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLAINT OF PAIN <input type="checkbox"/> AFRAID <input type="checkbox"/> BRUISE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> THREATENING <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR CUT(S) <input type="checkbox"/> NERVOUS <input type="checkbox"/> LACERATION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> PANICKED <input type="checkbox"/> ABRASION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> APOLOGETIC <input type="checkbox"/> FRACTURE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> CRYING <input type="checkbox"/> CONCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> CALM <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	<input type="checkbox"/> ANGRY <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLAINT OF PAIN <input type="checkbox"/> ANTAGONIZING <input type="checkbox"/> BRUISE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> THREATENING <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR CUT(S) <input type="checkbox"/> NERVOUS <input type="checkbox"/> LACERATION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> PANICKED <input type="checkbox"/> ABRASION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> APOLOGETIC <input type="checkbox"/> FRACTURE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> CRYING <input type="checkbox"/> CONCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> CALM <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER
Name: _____ D.O.B.: ____/____/____	Name: _____ D.O.B.: ____/____/____

Relationship between Victim and Suspect: (mark all that apply) <input type="checkbox"/> SPOUSE <input type="checkbox"/> FORMER SPOUSE <input type="checkbox"/> COHABITANTS <input type="checkbox"/> FORMER COHABITANTS <input type="checkbox"/> DATING/ENGAGED <input type="checkbox"/> FORMER DATING <input type="checkbox"/> SAME SEX <input type="checkbox"/> CHILD IN COMMON	LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP Year(s) _____ Month(s) _____ DATE RELATIONSHIP ENDED: _____ LENGTH OF COHABITATION Year(s) _____ Month(s) _____
---	---

WITNESS/CHILDREN	WITNESS/CHILDREN
<input type="checkbox"/> ANGRY <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLAINT OF PAIN <input type="checkbox"/> AFRAID <input type="checkbox"/> BRUISE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> NERVOUS <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR CUT(S) <input type="checkbox"/> PANICKED <input type="checkbox"/> LACERATION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> APOLOGETIC <input type="checkbox"/> ABRASION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> CRYING <input type="checkbox"/> FRACTURE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> CALM <input type="checkbox"/> CONCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> WITHDRAWN <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER	<input type="checkbox"/> ANGRY <input type="checkbox"/> COMPLAINT OF PAIN <input type="checkbox"/> AFRAID <input type="checkbox"/> BRUISE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> NERVOUS <input type="checkbox"/> MINOR CUT(S) <input type="checkbox"/> PANICKED <input type="checkbox"/> LACERATION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> APOLOGETIC <input type="checkbox"/> ABRASION(S) <input type="checkbox"/> CRYING <input type="checkbox"/> FRACTURE(S) <input type="checkbox"/> CALM <input type="checkbox"/> CONCUSSION <input type="checkbox"/> WITHDRAWN <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER
Name: _____ D.O.B.: ____/____/____	Name: _____ D.O.B.: ____/____/____

WITNESS/CHILDREN INFORMATION Child(ren) present during domestic violence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Child(ren)'s statement(s) taken? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Witness present during domestic violence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Witness statement(s) taken? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Names, ages and DOB's of ALL children present: _____	LETHALITY II Recently separated after living together or marriage? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Has (S) ever tried to kill himself/herself? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Do you have a child that (S) knows is not (S)'s? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Has (S) ever tried to "choke" (V)? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Is there a protective order in place? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Is (S) violently or constantly jealous or controlling of most of (V) daily activities? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Does (S) have a gun or can (S) get one easily? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U How often has (S) threatened to kill you w/in the past 7 days? <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1-3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4+ Does (S) follow / spy on you or leave threatening messages? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Is (V) pregnant? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Is (S) unemployed? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U
---	---

LETHALITY I	
Has (S) ever used/threatened to use a weapon against you? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Has (S) ever threatened to kill you or your children? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U Do you think (S) may try to kill you? <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/> U	U = Unable or Unwilling to Respond
INCIDENT INFORMATION & HISTORY	
911 Call Completed? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Police Contacted By: <input type="checkbox"/> Victim <input type="checkbox"/> Family Member(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Neighbor <input type="checkbox"/> Other Name: _____ Phone #: _____	
Who was the first <u>non-police</u> person V contacted during or after the incident? Name: _____ Phone #: _____	
Threats made to victim in officer's presence? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, state threat: _____	
Domestic-related prior unreported incident(s) between (S)&(V)? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, approximate # of prior incidents: _____	
Will victim and/or witness be at a temporary location? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, list contact information: _____	
Names and phone #'s of two people who can reach V at all times: <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Name: _____ Phone #: _____ </div> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> Name: _____ Phone #: _____ </div>	
Non-English Speaking Assistance needed or utilized? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If Non-English Speaking assistance needed or utilized, what language? <input type="checkbox"/> Spanish <input type="checkbox"/> Burmese <input type="checkbox"/> French <input type="checkbox"/> Punjabi <input type="checkbox"/> Sign Lang <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
IMPD DV ADVOCATE notified for victim follow-up? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

Marion County, Indiana

Independent Corroborating Evidence
(Evidence BEYOND Victim's Statement & Injury)

Photos/Property Room

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | <input type="checkbox"/> / <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | <input type="checkbox"/> / <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | <input type="checkbox"/> / <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. | <input type="checkbox"/> / <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. | <input type="checkbox"/> / <input type="checkbox"/> |

STRANGULATION OR "CHOKING" ALLEGED? ☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ U (Unable or Unwilling to Respond)

STRANGULATION EVIDENCE: VISIBLE SIGNS

- ☐ SCRATCH MARKS ☐ RED MARKS ☐ RED SPOTS ☐ RED EYES (BLOOD) ☐ COUGHING BLOOD
☐ SWELLING ☐ BRUISING ☐ INVOLUNTARY URINATION/DEFECATION ☐ NONE (At Present Time)

STRANGULATION EVIDENCE: NON-VISIBLE SIGNS

- ☐ DIFFICULTY SWALLOWING ☐ RASPY VOICE ☐ NAUSEA ☐ SORENESS TO THROAT ☐ LOSS OF CONSCIOUSNESS
☐ DIFFICULTY BREATHING ☐ HYPERVENTILATION ☐ COUGHING ☐ NONE (At Present Time)

Photographic Documentation:

Taken at: ☐ Crime Scene ☐ Hospital ☐ Other: _____

Taken of: ☐ Victim's injuries ☐ Suspect's injuries ☐ Crime Scene

Weapon(s) Documentation:

Weapon(s) used during incident: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ U (Unable or Unwilling to Respond)

Type of weapon used: _____

Weapon(s) seized: ☐ Yes ☐ No

PROPERTY TAG NUMBER

Medical Treatment:

- ☐ Will Seek Own Doctor
☐ None
☐ First Aid
☐ Hospital
☐ Declined Medical Aid

Paramedics at Scene: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Unit Number: _____

Hospital: _____
Name(s) _____ ID# _____

Suspect under the influence of: ☐ Alcohol ☐ Drug ☐ N/A

Victim under the influence of: ☐ Alcohol ☐ Drug ☐ N/A

Additional Information that concerns officer about this run:

Victim's Rights Card Given? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Reporting Officer: _____ ID: _____ Unit: _____ Beat: _____ Case Number: _____

Revised 3/2012